



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,765	11/19/2001	Manfred Bartz	CYPR-CD01194M	2082

7590 09/19/2007
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/19/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,765

Applicant(s)

BARTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE filed 07/03/2007 to the original application filed 11/19/2001.

Claims 1-30 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

The cross references related to the application cited in the specification must be updated (i.e., update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriate, on page 13). Correction is required.

Request Continuation for Examination

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/03/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 4-11, 14-21, and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anderson et al.** (US 6282551, filed 07/20/1998) in view of **Rajarajan et al.** (US 6950990, filed 12/11/2001).

As to claim 1:

Anderson teaches a method and computer-usable medium for facilitating the display of information of a document (*e.g., a spreadsheet notebook*) for a selected user module (*e.g., the user simply selects the corresponding tab from tabs 260*) [*e.g., see the Abstract and the discussion beginning at col.8, line 3*], the method comprising:

- receiving the selected user module wherein the user module acts as a preconfigured function for a target device (*col. 11, lines 4-19; col. 15, line 55-col. 16, line 13; and col. 17, line 61-col. 18, line 15*);
- scanning said document corresponding to the selected user module for indicators, wherein the indicators are for indicating a predetermined location within the document in response to said scanning, automatically rendering graphic elements for each corresponding indicator (*e.g., individual notebook pages are identified by page identifiers 260, preferably located along one edge of the notebook 250 ... each page identifier is in the form of a tab member (e.g., members 261a, 262a, 263a) situated along a bottom edge of the notebook. Each tab member may include representative indicia, such as textual or graphic labels, including user-selected titles representing the contents of a corresponding page ... simply select the tab corresponding to the page; col.8, lines 3-67, col.9, lines 35-56 and see also figs. 2C-E*); and
- jumping to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to a selected graphic element and displaying information of said predetermined location (*e.g., movement 'i.e., location of desired information cells' within a spreadsheet notebook... to move to different pages in the notebook, the user simply selects the corresponding tab from tabs 260. To move to Page B, for example, the user selects tab 262a; similarly, Page C is reached by selecting tab*

263a ... the user may return to Page A by selecting tab 261a. Thus instead of finding information by scrolling different parts of a large spreadsheet, or by invoking multiple windows of a conventional three-dimensional spreadsheet, the present invention allows the user to simply and conveniently "flip through" several pages of the notebook to rapidly locate information of interest) [col. 8, lines 33-67; see also figs. 3A-C].

Anderson, however, does not specifically teach corresponding to the selected graphic element, moving a scroll box to a location of a scroll bar that indicates a current location within the document, the scroll bar and the scroll box for scrolling through the document.

Rajarajan teaches corresponding to the selected graphic element, moving a scroll box to a location of a scroll bar that indicates a current location within the document, the scroll bar and the scroll box for scrolling through the document (*col. 30, lines 30-57*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Anderson with Rajarajan because Rajarajan's teaching would have provided advanced capability for customizing output information for a particular client computer system, allowing the use of many different types of client computer systems (e.g., laptops, desktops, PDAs, cell phones, etc), and communicating with the client computer system to provide the proper format and amount of output information, as well as input information.

As to claims 4 and 14:

Anderson does not specifically teach an HTML document.

Rajarajan teaches an HTML document (*e.g., an HTML document*) [*see the discussion beginning at col.28, line 3*].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rajarajan with Anderson because Rajarajan's teaching would have provided the capability for performing scenario-based tasks requiring interaction with multiple resources while providing a uniform user interface for each of the multiple resources.

As to claims 5 and 15:

Anderson does not specifically teach embedded HTML anchors.

Rajarajan teaches embedded HTML anchors (*e.g., the URL*) [*see the discussion beginning at col.35, line 43*].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rajarajan with Anderson because Rajarajan's teaching would have provided the capability for performing scenario-based tasks requiring

Art Unit: 2176

interaction with multiple resources while providing a uniform user interface for each of the multiple resources.

As to claims 6 and 16:

Anderson does not specifically teach “*an XML document*.”

Rajarajan teaches an XML document (*e.g., an XML document*) [see col.35, lines 43-64].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rajarajan with Anderson because Rajarajan’s teaching would have provided the capability for performing scenario-based tasks requiring interaction with multiple resources while providing a uniform user interface for each of the multiple resources.

As to claims 7 and 17:

Anderson teaches the document is selected from a catalog of documents (*see col.2, lines 13-65*).

As to claims 9 and 19:

Anderson teaches the graphic elements are rendered adjacent to the document (*see col. 7, line 45-col. 8, line32*).

As to claims 10 and 20:

Anderson teaches an interaction with the scroll bar activates a graphic element upon passing a corresponding indicator of the graphic element, such that a current location on the document is rendered (*col. 8, lines 32-67 and see figs. 3A-C*).

As to claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Anderson teaches a bus (*e.g., a system bus 110*); a display device (*e.g., a display device 106*); a memory (*e.g., a main memory 102*); and a processor (*e.g., a central processor 101*) [*col.5, lines 21-31 & also see fig.1*].

5. Claims 2, 3, 12, 13 and 21- 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anderson et al.** in view of **Rajarajan et al.** as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of **Insenser Farre et al.** (US 6460172, filed 06/2000).

As to claims 2, 12, and 22:

The combination of Anderson and Rajarajan does not specifically teach “*the document is for use in programming a programmable microcontroller comprising programmable digital and programmable analog elements.*”

Insenser Farre teaches the document is for use in programming a programmable microcontroller comprising programmable digital and programmable analog elements *(e.g., [A] user-programmable integrated circuit ... directly interface the digital part of the analog and digital signals from the microprocessor and from the programmable logic, and configure and dynamically reconfigure all the programmable features of the system with the microprocessor, between countless other possibilities; see Abstract and col.2, lines 40-67).*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Insenser Farre with Anderson as modified by Rajarajan because it would have allowed the user(s) to read the digital signals implemented in the programmable logic array as memory locations in real time, directly interface the digital part of the analog and digital signals from the microprocessor and from the programmable logic, and dynamically reconfigure all the programmable features of the system with the microprocessor.

As to claims 3, 13, and 23:

The combination of Anderson and Rajarajan does not specifically teach *“the document is a datasheet providing technical details of a corresponding user module, wherein a user module is a pre-configured circuit design for implementation on a microcontroller.”*

Insenser Farre teaches the document is a datasheet providing technical details of a corresponding user module, wherein a user module is a pre-configured circuit design for implementation on a microcontroller (*see Abstract, col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 31-61*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Insenser Farre with Anderson as modified by Rajarajan because it would have allowed the user(s) to read the digital signals implemented in the programmable logic array as memory locations in real time, directly interface the digital part of the analog and digital signals from the microprocessor and from the programmable logic, and dynamically reconfigure all the programmable features of the system with the microprocessor.

As to claims 8, 18, and 28:

Anderson teaches the user module is selected from a catalog of user modules (*see col. 3, line 44-col. 4, line 3*).

As to claim 21:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, the combination of Anderson and Rajarajan does not specifically teach does not teach the use of an integrated circuit.

Insenser Farre teaches the use of an integrated circuit (e.g., *[A] user-programmable integrated circuit; see Abstract*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Insenser Farre with Anderson as modified by Rajarajan because it would have allowed the user(s) to read the digital signals implemented in the programmable logic array as memory locations in real time, directly interface the digital part of the analog and digital signals from the microprocessor and from the programmable logic, and dynamically reconfigure all the programmable features of the system with the microprocessor.

As to claims 24-30:

Refer to the discussion of claims 4-10 above, respectively, for rejections.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to Claims 1-30 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the combination of Anderson and Rajarajan does not teach *corresponding to the selected graphic element, moving a scroll box to a location of a*

scroll bar that indicates a current location within the document, the scroll bar and the scroll box for scrolling through the document [Remarks, page 8].

Applicant's arguments are substantially directed to the amended subject matter. The amended subject matter is addressed above with respect to the discussion of independent Claims 1, 11 and 21.

Regarding Claims 2, 3, 12, 13, 22 and 23, Applicant argues that the combination of with Anderson and Rajarajan does not teach a "microcontroller".

In response, the newly applied prior art (**Insenser Farre**) is used to teach the limitations as claimed.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2176

Contact information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

MN

William F. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER